



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,577	11/21/2003	Renny Tse-Haw Ling	3313-1062P	9391

2292 7590 12/07/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

GALL, LLOYD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3676

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,577

Applicant(s)

LING ET AL.

Examiner

Lloyd A. Gall

Art Unit

3676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 6, line 20, "1413" should read --1412--. On page 9, lines 13-14 and 21-22, in viewing figure 2A, it is not clear where the second hook 152 is.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: On page 13, line 14, it is not clear what is meant by "corresponding to the locking wheel". See page 14, line 13 also. On page 13, line 15, it is not clear what is meant by "to press the slider". On page 13, lines 16-17, it is not clear what is meant by "being turnable to the recess", since the recess is located in the locking wheel. On page 13, line 17, it is not clear what is meant by "corresponding to the latch". On page 13, line 20, it is not clear what is meant by "to provide the slider a force towards the locking wheel". On page 13, line 23, "slider stationary" should be replaced with --stationary slider--. On page 14, line 14, there is no antecedent basis for "the latch lock". On page 14, line 14, it is not clear what is meant by "to press the slider". On page 14, line 14, there is no antecedent basis for "the slider". On page 14, lines 15-16, it is not clear what is meant by "being turnable to the recess", since the recess is located in the locking wheel. On page 14, line 16, it is not clear what is meant by "corresponding to the latch". On page 14, line 17, there is no antecedent basis for "the separation position". In claim 8, there is no antecedent basis for "the latch" or for "the slider", or for "the locking wheel". In claim 8, it is not clear what is meant by to provide the slider a force towards the locking wheel". Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3676

In view of the above objections to the claims, the respective claims are rejected as best understood, on prior art, as follows.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wake (485).

Wake teaches a latch lock structure including a sliding dock 102, a shell 101, 105 having a hook 108, a lock assembly including a dial ring 116, a locking wheel 122 having a recess 123, a spring 130 or 113, a movable hook 115a, 115b having a release position in fig. 5 corresponding to an unlocking condition and a latch position in fig. 6 corresponding to a locking condition, a latch 115d, and numerical marks as seen in fig. 2.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wake (485) in view of Keyaki.

Wake teaches all of the claimed structure as set forth above, but does not teach a second slider of identical construction. Keyaki teaches using two identical sliders 2, 3

Art Unit: 3676

along the length of a zipper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a second, identical slider along the length of the zipper of Wake, in view of the teaching of Keyaki. With respect to claim 4, either slider of Wake as modified by Keyaki may be held in a stationary, locked position.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lloyd A. Gall whose telephone number is 703-308-0828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on 703-308-2151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LG LG
December 3, 2004


Lloyd A. Gall
Primary Examiner